

*REMARKS*

The Office Action and cited references have been reviewed. Claims 1-22 are rejected and remain pending. No claims have been amended or cancelled. No new claims have been added. Consideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

*Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112*

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action has also rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention.

After a review of the Office Action dated June 8, 2006, it appeared to the Applicant that an inadvertent misunderstanding had occurred regarding the claim amendments made in the Response of March 31, 2006. Therefore, the Applicant requested an Interview with Examiner Terry K. Cecil to address the issue. The Examiner kindly granted the request and an Interview was held on June 29, 2006. During the interview, the Applicant pointed out that the outlet in Fig. 1 was not equivalent to the filter head exit port. Therefore, as recited in the claim amendments, fluid communication between the inlet and the filter head exit port was possible and described and shown in the application.

After this brief discussion, the misunderstanding was amicably solved. With the misunderstanding of the claim amendments remedied, the pending claims, as amended, were discussed and it was agreed that the claims did not read upon U.S. Pat. No. 2,932,400 to Scavuzzo.

In light of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and a notice of allowance be issued. In the alternative, should the claim amendments made in the previous Response necessitate a new ground of rejection, the Applicant respectfully requests that the finality of the Office Action dated June 8, 2006, be withdrawn and prosecution of this matter be reopened.

*Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Because the claim amendments from the previous Response were misunderstood, the Office Action did not withdraw the obviousness rejection. However, now that the

In re Appln. Of: Michael E. Buhl, et al.  
Application No.: 10/636,117

misunderstanding has been remedied, reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendments, as explained in the previously filed Response, is requested.

*Conclusion*

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

William H. Dietrich, Reg. No. 48359  
Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren P.C.  
483 N. Mulford Road, Suite 7  
Rockford, Illinois 61107  
(815) 484-1900 (telephone)  
(815) 484-1032 (facsimile)

Date: June 30, 2006